

Compositions of consistent systems of rank one discrete valuation rings

William J. Heinzer, Louis J. Ratliff, Jr., and David E. Rush

September 26, 2008

Abstract

Let V be a rank one discrete valuation ring (DVR) on a field F and let L/F be a finite separable algebraic field extension with $[L : F] = m$. The integral closure of V in L is a Dedekind domain that encodes the following invariants: (i) the number s of extensions of V to a valuation ring W_i on L , (ii) the residue degree f_i of W_i over V , and (iii) the ramification degree e_i of W_i over V . These invariants are related by the classical formula $m = \sum_{i=1}^s e_i f_i$. Given a finite set $\mathbf{V}$ of DVRs on the field F , an m -consistent system for $\mathbf{V}$ is a family of sets enumerating what is theoretically possible for the above invariants of each $V \in \mathbf{V}$. The m -consistent system is said to be realizable for $\mathbf{V}$ if there exists a finite separable extension field L/F that gives for each $V \in \mathbf{V}$ the listed invariants. We investigate the realizability of m -consistent systems for $\mathbf{V}$ for various positive integers m . Our general technique is to “compose” several realizable consistent systems to obtain new consistent systems that are realizable for $\mathbf{V}$. We apply the new results to the set of Rees valuation rings of a nonzero proper ideal I in a Noetherian domain R of altitude one.

1 Introduction.

All rings in this paper are commutative with a unit $1 \neq 0$. Let I be a regular proper ideal of the Noetherian ring R , that is, I contains a regular element of R and $I \neq R$. An ideal J of R is **projectively equivalent** to I if there exist positive integers m and n such that $(I^m)_a = (J^n)_a$, where $K_a = \{x \in R \mid x \text{ satisfies an equation of the form } x^h + k_1 x^{h-1} + \cdots + k_h, \text{ where } k_j \in K^j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, h\}$ is the **integral closure in** R of an ideal K of R . The concept of projective equivalence of ideals and the study of ideals projectively equivalent to I was introduced by Samuel in [16] and further developed by Nagata in [13] and Rees in [14]. See [4] for a recent survey. Let $\mathbf{P}(I)$ denote the set of integrally closed ideals that are projectively equivalent to I . The ideal I is said to be **projectively full** if $\mathbf{P}(I)$

$= \{(I^n)_a \mid n \geq 1\}$ and $\mathbf{P}(I)$ is said to be **projectively full** if $\mathbf{P}(I) = \mathbf{P}(J)$ for some projectively full ideal J of R .

The set $\text{Rees } I$ of Rees valuation rings of I is a finite set of rank one discrete valuation rings (DVRs) that determine the integral closure $(I^n)_a$ of I^n for every positive integer n and are the unique minimal set of DVRs having this property. Consider the minimal primes z of R such that IR/z is a proper nonzero ideal. The set $\text{Rees } I$ is the union of the sets $\text{Rees } IR/z$. Thus one is reduced to describing the set $\text{Rees } I$ in the case where I is a nonzero proper ideal of a Noetherian integral domain R . Consider the Rees ring $\mathbf{R} = R[t^{-1}, It]$. The integral closure $\mathbf{R}'$ of $\mathbf{R}$ is a Krull domain, so $W = \mathbf{R}'_p$ is a DVR for each minimal prime p of $t^{-1}\mathbf{R}'$, and $V = W \cap F$, where F is the field of fractions of R , is also a DVR. The set $\text{Rees } I$ of Rees valuation rings of I is the set of DVRs V obtained in this way, cf. [17, Section 10.1].

If $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ are the Rees valuation rings of I , then the integers $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$, where $IV_i = N_i^{e_i}$, are the **Rees integers** of I . Necessary and sufficient conditions for two regular proper ideals I and J to be projectively equivalent are that (i) $\text{Rees } I = \text{Rees } J$ and (ii) the Rees integers of I and J are proportional [1, Theorem 3.4]. If I is integrally closed and each Rees integer of I is one, then I is a projectively full radical ideal.¹

A main goal in the papers [1], [2], [3], [4], [9] and [10], is to answer the following question:

Question 1.1 Let I be a nonzero proper ideal in a Noetherian domain R . Under what conditions does there exist a finite integral extension domain A of R such that $\mathbf{P}(IA)$ contains an ideal J whose Rees integers are all equal to one?

Progress is made on Question 1.1 in [3]. To describe this progress, let I be a regular proper ideal of the Noetherian ring R , let $b_1, \dots, b_g$ be regular elements in R that generate I , and for each positive integer $m > 1$ let $A_m = R[x_1, \dots, x_g] = R[X_1, \dots, X_g]/(X_1^m - b_1, \dots, X_g^m - b_g)$ and let $J_m = (x_1, \dots, x_g)A_m$. Let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ be the Rees valuation rings of I . Consider the following hypothesis on $I = (b_1, \dots, b_g)R$:

- (a) $b_i V_j = IV_j (= N_j^{e_j}, \text{ say})$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$.

¹Example 5.1 of [2] demonstrates that there exist integrally closed local domains (R, M) for which M is not projectively full. Remark 4.10 and Example 4.14 of [1] show that a sufficient, but not necessary, condition for I to be projectively full is that the gcd of the Rees integers of I is equal to one.

(b) the greatest common divisor c of $e_1, \dots, e_n$ is a unit in R .

(b') the least common multiple d of $e_1, \dots, e_n$ is a unit in R .

Then the main result in [3] establishes the following:

Theorem 1.2 *If (a) and (b) hold, then $A_c = R[x_1, \dots, x_g]$ is a finite free integral extension ring of R and the ideal $J_c = (x_1, \dots, x_g)A_c$ is projectively full and projectively equivalent to IA_c . Also, if R is an integral domain and if z is a minimal prime ideal in A_c , then $((J_c + z)/z)_a$ is a projectively full ideal in A_c/z that is projectively equivalent to $(IA_c + z)/z$.*

We prove in [9, (3.19) and (3.20)] that if either (i) R contains an infinite field, or (ii) R is a local ring with an infinite residue field, then it is possible to choose generators $b_1, \dots, b_g$ of I that satisfy assumption (a) of Theorem 1.2. Thus the following result, [9, (3.7)] , applies in these cases.

Theorem 1.3 *If (a) and (b') hold, then for each positive multiple m of d that is a unit in R the ideal $(J_m)_a$ is projectively full and $(J_m)_a$ is a radical ideal that is projectively equivalent to IA_m . Also, the Rees integers of J_m are all equal to one and $x_i U$ is the maximal ideal of U for each Rees valuation ring U of J_m and for $i = 1, \dots, g$. Moreover, if R is an integral domain and if z is a minimal prime ideal in A_m , then $((J_m + z)/z)_a$ is a projectively full radical ideal that is projectively equivalent to $(IA_m + z)/z$.*

Examples [9, (3.22) and (3.23)] show that even if R is the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of rational integers, condition (b') of Theorem 1.3 is needed for the proof given in [9]. Theorem 1.4 is the main result in [10].

Theorem 1.4 *Let I be a nonzero proper ideal in a Noetherian integral domain R .*

1. *There exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R and a positive integer m such that all the Rees integers of IA are equal to m .*
2. *If R has altitude one, then there exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R such that $\mathbf{P}(IA)$ contains an ideal H whose Rees integers are all equal to*

one. Therefore $H = \text{Rad}(IA)$ is a projectively full radical ideal that is projectively equivalent to IA .

Observe that Theorem 1.4.2, answers Question 1.1 in the affirmative for each nonzero proper ideal I in an arbitrary Noetherian integral domain R of altitude one with no additional conditions; therefore the conclusions of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are valid without the assumption of conditions (a), (b), and (b') if R is a Noetherian integral domain of altitude one. In particular, Theorem 1.4.2 shows that these conclusions hold for the examples [9, (3.22) and (3.23)].

A classical theorem of Krull, stated as Theorem 2.1 below, is an important tool in the present paper and in [10]. We use the following terminology from [7] and [10].

Definition 1.5 Let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ be distinct DVRs of a field F and for $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $K_i = V_i/N_i$ denote the residue field of V_i . Let m be a positive integer. By an **m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$** , we mean a collection of sets $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$, where $K_{i,j}$ is a simple algebraic field extension of K_i , $f_{i,j} = [K_{i,j} : K_i]$, and $s_i, e_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N}_+$ (the set of positive integers).
- (2) For each i , the sum $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j} = m$.

Definition 1.6 The m -consistent system S for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ as in Definition 1.5 is said to be **realizable** for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ if there exists a separable algebraic extension field L of F such that:

- (a) $[L : F] = m$.
- (b) For $1 \leq i \leq n$, V_i has exactly s_i extensions $(V_{i,1}, N_{i,1}), \dots, (V_{i,s_i}, N_{i,s_i})$ to L .
- (c) The residue field $V_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$ of $V_{i,j}$ is K_i -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$, so $[K_{i,j} : K_i] = f_{i,j}$, and the ramification index of $V_{i,j}$ over V_i is $e_{i,j}$, so $N_i V_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{e_{i,j}}$.

If S and L are as above, we say the field L **realizes** S for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ or that L is a **realization** of S for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$.

Let $\mathbf{V} = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, $n > 1$, be a finite set of distinct DVRs on the field F . In this paper we explore various facets of the realizability of consistent systems for $\mathbf{V}$. If

$S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ is an m -consistent system for $\mathbf{V}$, realizable or not, we prove in Theorem 2.3 (resp., Theorem 2.7) that by uniformly increasing the ramification indices (resp., finite-residue-field degrees) by the factor m the resulting system is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\mathbf{V}$. The proofs involve composing two related realizable consistent systems.

Let $M_1, \dots, M_n$, $n > 1$, be distinct maximal ideals of the Dedekind domain D and let $\mathbf{V} = \{D_{M_1}, \dots, D_{M_n}\}$ be the related family of DVRs. Let $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$. Then by composing two related systems we prove in Theorem 3.3 that the $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system $S = \{S(D_{M_1}), \dots, S(D_{M_n})\}$ is realizable for $\mathbf{V}$, where $S(D_{M_i}) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. It follows that if E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of S for $\mathbf{V}$, and if $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i}$ are the maximal ideals in E that contain $M_i E$, then $E/N_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j} \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}$, so $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$ is a **radical power** ideal in the sense that it is a power of its radical. We also prove a theorem analogous to Theorem 3.3 for each nonzero proper ideal in an arbitrary Noetherian domain of altitude one. Proposition 3.13 characterizes the conditions a realizable m -consistent system S' for $\mathbf{V}$ must satisfy to insure that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^t$ for some positive integer t , where E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of S' for $\mathbf{V}$.

Under the hypothesis that each residue field D/M_i is finite, we prove in Section 4 that every consistent system $T = \{T(D_{M_1}), \dots, T(D_{M_n})\}$ of the following form is realizable for $\mathbf{V}$: $T(D_{M_i}) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$; here the f_i are arbitrary positive integers for which $[D/M_i : F_i] = f_i$ for some subfield F_i of D/M_i . Therefore if E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of T for $\mathbf{V}$ and if $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,f_i}$ are the maximal ideals in E that contain M_i , then $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j} E_{N_{i,j}}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and each $j = 1, \dots, f_i$. Under the same hypothesis on the D/M_i , we establish in Section 4 finite-residue-field degree analogs of some of the other results in Section 3.

Under the hypothesis that each residue field D/M_i is finite, we prove in Section 5 that every consistent system $U = \{U(D_{M_1}), \dots, U(D_{M_n})\}$ of the following form is realizable for $\mathbf{V}$: $U(D_{M_i}) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where the e_i and f_i are as in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Therefore if E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of U for $\mathbf{V}$ and if $N_{i,j}, \dots, N_{i,e_i f_i}$ are the maximal ideals in E that contain M_i ,

then $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$ and $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and each $j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i$.

Our notation is mainly as in Nagata [12], so, for example, the term **altitude** refers to what is often also called dimension or Krull dimension, and a **basis** of an ideal is a set of generators of the ideal.

2 The realizability of m -consistent systems.

To prove the main results in this section, we use the following theorem of Krull.

Theorem 2.1 (Krull [11]): *Let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ be distinct DVRs with quotient field F , let m be a positive integer, and let $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then S is realizable for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ if one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- (i) $s_i = 1$ for at least one i .
- (ii) F has at least one DVR V distinct from $V_1, \dots, V_n$.
- (iii) *For each monic polynomial $X^t + a_1 X^{t-1} + \cdots + a_t$ with $a_i \in \cap_{i=1}^n V_i = D$, and for each $h \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an irreducible separable polynomial $X^t + b_1 X^{t-1} + \cdots + b_t \in D[X]$ with $b_l - a_l \in N_i^h$ for each $l = 1, \dots, t$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Observe that condition (i) of Theorem 2.1 is a property of the m -consistent system $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$, whereas condition (ii) is a property of the family of DVRs with quotient field F , and condition (iii) is a property of the family $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$.

The result of Krull stated in Theorem 2.1 is a generalization of a classical result of Hasse [8] which shows that all m -consistent systems for a given finite set of distinct DVRs of an algebraic number field F are realizable. This has been extended further by P. Ribenboim, O. Endler and L. C. Hill, among others. For a good sampling of these results on when an m -consistent system is realizable, see [5, Sections 25 - 27] and [6]. These references give several sufficient conditions on the realizability of an m -consistent system for a given finite set $\mathbf{V} = \{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ of distinct DVRs V_i with quotient field F .

Remark 2.2 (2.2.1) There is an obvious necessary condition for an m -consistent system to be realizable. If $n = 1$ and V_1 is a Henselian DVR, then no m -consistent system $S = \{S(V_1)\}$, where $S(V_1) = \{(K_1, f_1, e_1), \dots, (K_s, f_s, e_s)\}$ with $s > 1$ is realizable for $\{V_1\}$, since V_1 is Henselian if and only if V_1 has a unique extension to each finite algebraic extension field of its quotient field F , cf. [12, (43.12)]. It follows from Theorem 2.1(ii) that if V is a Henselian DVR, then V is the unique DVR with quotient field F . It is not true, however, that V being the unique DVR on its quotient field implies that V is Henselian. For example, using that the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers admits only countably many DVRs, it is possible to repeatedly use Theorem 2.1 to construct an infinite algebraic extension field F of $\mathbb{Q}$ such that F admits a unique DVR V having quotient field F and yet V is not Henselian.

(2.2.2) Related to (2.2.1), it is shown in [15, Theorem 1] that, for each positive integer n , there exist fields F_n that admit exactly n DVRs $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ having quotient field F_n . Moreover, the proof of [15, Theorem 1] shows that such F_n can be chosen so that there are no realizable m -consistent systems S for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ having the property that $m > 1$, and, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ has at least one j with $(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) = (V_i/N_i, 1, 1)$.

Theorem 2.3, is a new sufficient condition for realizability; by Remark 2.2.1, the hypothesis $n > 1$ in Theorem 2.3 is essential.

Theorem 2.3 *Let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$, $n > 1$, be distinct DVRs with quotient field F , let $m > 1$ be a positive integer, and let $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where, $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $S^* = \{S^*(V_1), \dots, S^*(V_n)\}$ is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where $S^*(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, me_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. If $s_i = 1$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$, then Theorem 2.1(i) implies that S is a realizable m -consistent system and S^* is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, so it may be assumed that $s_i > 1$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Define $S_1(V_i) = S(V_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $S_1(V_n) = \{((V_n/N_n), 1, m)\}$, and recall that $n > 1$. Theorem 2.1(i) implies that $S_1 = \{S_1(V_1), \dots, S_1(V_{n-1}), S_1(V_n)\}$ is a realizable

m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$. Let L_1 be a realization of S_1 for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$. Thus L_1 is a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree m . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $(W_{i,j}, N_{i,j})$ be the valuation rings of L_1 that lie over V_i . It follows from the prescription of S_1 that there are exactly s_i such rings for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and exactly one such ring for $i = n$. Also, $W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$ is (V_i/N_i) -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$ and $N_i W_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{e_{i,j}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, while $W_{n,1}/N_{n,1}$ is (V_n/N_n) -isomorphic to V_n/N_n and $N_n W_{n,1} = N_{n,1}^m$.

Let $S_2 = \{S_2(W_{1,1}), \dots, S_2(W_{n-1,s_{n-1}}), S_2(W_{n,1})\}$, where $S_2(W_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, m)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, and where $S_2(W_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}, f_{n,j}, e_{n,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_n\}$. Thus $S_2(W_{n,1})$ is essentially equal to $S(V_n)$. It is readily checked that S_2 is an m -consistent system for $\mathcal{W} := \{W_{1,1}, \dots, W_{n-1,s_{n-1}}, W_{n,1}\}$, and by Theorem 2.1(i) it is realizable for $\mathcal{W}$. Let L be a realization of S_2 for $\mathcal{W}$. Thus L is a separable algebraic extension field of L_1 of degree m , and hence a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree m^2 . Moreover, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$ there exists a unique valuation ring $(U_{i,j}, P_{i,j})$ of L that lies over $W_{i,j}$, and $U_{i,j}/P_{i,j}$ is $(W_{i,j}/N_{i,j})$ -isomorphic to $W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$; also, $W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$ is (V_i/N_i) -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$, so $U_{i,j}/P_{i,j}$ is (V_i/N_i) -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$, and $N_{i,j} U_{i,j} = P_{i,j}^m$, so $N_i U_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{me_{i,j}}$. On the other hand, for $i = n$ there are exactly s_n valuation rings $(U_{n,j}, P_{n,j})$ that lie over $(W_{n,1}, N_{n,1})$, and for $j = 1, \dots, s_n$, $U_{n,j}/P_{n,j}$ is $(W_{n,1}/N_{n,1})$ -isomorphic to $K_{n,j}$, and $W_{n,1}/N_{n,1}$ is (V_n/N_n) -isomorphic to V_n/N_n , so $U_{n,j}/P_{n,j}$ is (V_n/N_n) -isomorphic to $K_{n,j}$, and $N_{n,1} U_{n,j} = P_{n,j}^{e_{n,j}}$, so $N_n U_{n,j} = P_{n,j}^{me_{n,j}}$. It therefore follows that L is a realization of the m^2 -consistent system $S^* = \{S^*(V_1), \dots, S^*(V_n)\}$ for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where $S^*(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, me_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus S^* is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$. ■

Remark 2.4 Fix $g \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Then essentially the same proof as given for Theorem 2.3 shows that the following two m -consistent systems T_1, T_2 are realizable and can be used in place of S_1, S_2 to prove Theorem 2.3. $T_1 = \{T_1(V_1), \dots, T_1(V_n)\}$, where $T_1(V_i) = S(V_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$, while $T_1(V_h) = \{((V_h/N_h), 1, m)\}$ for $h = g+1, \dots, n$. $T_2 = \{T_2(W_{1,1}), \dots, T_2(W_{g,s_g}), T_2(W_{g+1,1}), \dots, T_2(W_{n,1})\}$, where $T_2(W_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, m)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, g$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, while $T_2(W_{h,1}) = \{(K_{h,j}, f_{h,j}, e_{h,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_h\}$ for $h = g+1, \dots, n$ (so $T_2(W_{h,1})$ is essentially equal to $T(V_h)$ for $h = g+1, \dots, n$).

Corollary 2.5 *Let R be a Noetherian domain, let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ be the Rees valuation rings of I , let $m, s_1, \dots, s_n$ be positive integers, and let $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, say $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then there exists a separable algebraic extension field L of degree m^2 of the quotient field $R_{(0)}$ of R such that, for each finite integral extension domain A of R with quotient field L and for $i = 1, \dots, n$, IA has exactly s_i Rees valuation rings $(W_{i,j}, N_{i,j})$ that extend (V_i, N_i) , and then, for $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, the Rees integer of IA with respect to $W_{i,j}$ is $me_{i,j}$ and $[(W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}) : (V_i/N_i)] = f_{i,j}$.*

Proof. By [10, Remark 2.7] the extensions of the Rees valuation rings of I to the field L are the Rees valuation rings of IA , so this follows immediately from Theorem 2.3. ■

Theorem 2.7, is a new sufficient condition for realizability under the hypothesis that each of the valuation rings (V_i, N_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$, has a finite residue field. For this result and the results in Sections 4 and 5 we often implicitly use the following remark.

Remark 2.6 (2.6.1) Let F be a finite field. It is well known, see for example [19, pages 82–84], that the following hold: (i) Each finite extension field H of F is separable and thus a simple extension of F . (ii) If k is a positive integer and $\overline{F}$ is a fixed algebraic closure of F , then there exists a unique extension field $H \subseteq \overline{F}$ with $[H : F] = k$. (iii) If $H, K \subseteq \overline{F}$ are finite extension fields of F , then $H \subseteq K$ if and only if $[H : F]$ divides $[K : F]$.

(2.6.2) There are fields other than finite fields that satisfy the three conditions given in (2.6.1). If E is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and F is the field of fractions of the formal power series ring $E[[x]]$, then a theorem that goes back to Newton implies that F satisfies the conditions of (2.6.1) cf. [18, Theorem 3.1, page 98].

Theorem 2.7 *Let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ ($n > 1$) be distinct DVRs with quotient field F , where each V_i/N_i is finite. For each i let $\overline{V_i/N_i}$ denote a fixed algebraic closure of V_i/N_i . Let m be a positive integer, and let $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid K_{i,j} \subseteq \overline{V_i/N_i}$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $T^*(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}^*, mf_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$, where $K_{i,j}^* \subseteq \overline{V_i/N_i}$ is the unique field extension of $K_{i,j}$ with $[K_{i,j}^* : K_{i,j}] = m$. Then $T^* = \{T^*(V_1), \dots, T^*(V_n)\}$ is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$.*

Proof. If $m = 1$, then $s_i = f_{i,j} = e_{i,j} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, by Definition 1.5.2, so S is realizable for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, by Theorem 2.1(i), and $K_{i,j} = K_i$ for all i, j , so F is a realization of $S = T^*$ for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, so it may be assumed that $m > 1$. If $s_i = 1$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$, then S (resp., T^*) is a realizable m -consistent (resp., m^2 -consistent) system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, by Theorem 2.1(i), so it may be assumed that $s_i > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Since $n > 1$, let $T_1(V_n) = \{(H_n, m, 1)\}$, where $H_n \subseteq \overline{V_n/N_n}$ is the unique field extension of V_n/N_n with $[H_n : (V_n/N_n)] = m$. For $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ let $T_1(V_i) = S(V_i)$, and let $T_1 = \{T_1(V_1), \dots, T_1(V_{n-1}), T_1(V_n)\}$, so T_1 is a realizable m -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, by Theorem 2.1(i). Let L_1 be a realization of T_1 for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, so L_1 is a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree m . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $(W_{i,j}, N_{i,j})$ be the valuation rings of L_1 that lie over V_i . Then it follows from the prescription of T_1 that there are exactly s_i such rings for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, but only one such ring for $i = n$. Also, $W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$ is (V_i/N_i) -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$ and $N_i W_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{e_{i,j}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, while $W_{n,1}/N_{n,1}$ is (V_n/N_n) -isomorphic to H_n and $N_n W_{n,1} = N_{n,1}$.

For T_2 we use the fields $K_{i,j}^*$ in the statement of this theorem, so $K_{i,j} \subseteq K_{i,j}^*$ and $[K_{i,j}^* : K_{i,j}] = m$ for all i, j , so by Remark 2.6.1 it follows, from $[H_n : K_n] = m$, that $H_n \subseteq K_{n,j}^*$ and $[K_{n,j}^* : H_n] = f_{n,j}$. With this in mind, let $T_2 = \{T_2(W_{1,1}), \dots, T_2(W_{n-1,s_{n-1}}), T_2(W_{n,1})\}$, where $T_2(W_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j}^*, m, 1)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, and where $T_2(W_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}^*, f_{n,j}, e_{n,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_n\}$. It is readily checked that T_2 is an m -consistent system for $\mathcal{W} := \{W_{1,1}, \dots, W_{n-1,s_{n-1}}, W_{n,1}\}$. By Theorem 2.1(i) it is realizable for $\mathcal{W}$. Let L be a realization of T_2 for $\mathcal{W}$, so L is a separable algebraic extension field of L_1 of degree m (so L is a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree m^2), and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$ there exists a unique valuation ring $(U_{i,j}, P_{i,j})$ of L that lies over $W_{i,j}$ (and then $U_{i,j}/P_{i,j}$ is $(W_{i,j}/N_{i,j})$ -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}^*$ (and $W_{i,j}/N_{i,j} \supseteq (V_i/N_i)$, so $U_{i,j}/P_{i,j}$ is (V_i/N_i) -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}^*$) and $N_{i,j} U_{i,j} = P_{i,j}$, so $N_i U_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{e_{i,j}}$), while for $i = n$ there are exactly s_n valuation rings $(U_{n,j}, P_{n,j})$ that lie over $(W_{n,1}, N_{n,1})$, and for $j = 1, \dots, s_n$, $U_{n,j}/P_{n,j}$ is $(W_{n,1}/N_{n,1})$ -isomorphic to $K_{n,j}^*$ (and $W_{n,1}/N_{n,1} \supseteq (V_n/N_n)$, so $U_{n,j}/P_{n,j}$ is (V_n/N_n) -isomorphic to $K_{n,j}^*$) and $N_{n,1} U_{n,j} = P_{n,j}^{e_{n,j}}$, so $N_n U_{n,j} = P_{n,j}^{e_{n,j}}$. Also, since $U_{i,j}/P_{i,j}$ is a finite field for all i, j , it is a simple extension field of V_i/N_i (concerning this, see Definition 1.5(1)). It therefore follows that L is a realization of the m^2 -consistent system T^*

$= \{T^*(V_1), \dots, T^*(V_n)\}$ for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$, where $T^*(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}^*, m f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore T^* is a realizable m^2 -consistent system for $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$. ■

Remark 2.8 The hypothesis in Theorem 2.7 that each $K_i = V_i/N_i$ is finite is often not essential. Specifically, if the set of extension fields of the K_i have the following properties (a) - (c), then it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.7 that the conclusion holds, even though the K_i are not finite: (a) For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$ there exists a field $K_{i,j}^*$ such that $[K_{i,j}^* : K_{i,j}] = m$. (b) Each $K_{i,j}^*$ is a simple extension of K_i . (c) There exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ (say $i = n$) such that there exists a simple extension field H_n of K_n of degree m such that $H_n \subseteq K_{n,j}^*$ for $j = 1, \dots, s_n$ (so $[K_{n,j}^* : H_n] = f_{n,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s_n$).

Corollary 2.9 *Let R be a Noetherian domain, let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let $(V_1, N_1), \dots, (V_n, N_n)$ be the Rees valuation rings of I , let $m, s_1, \dots, s_n$ be positive integers, and let $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $V_1, \dots, V_n$, say $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume that each V_i/N_i is finite. Then there exists a separable algebraic extension field L of $R_{(0)}$ of degree m^2 such that, for each finite integral extension domain A of R with quotient field L and for $i = 1, \dots, n$, IA has exactly s_i Rees valuation rings $(W_{i,j}, N_{i,j})$ lying over V_i , and then, for $j = 1, \dots, s_i$, the Rees integer of IA with respect to $W_{i,j}$ is $e_{i,j}$ and $[(W_{i,j}/N_{i,j}) : (V_i/N_i)] = m f_{i,j}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Corollary 2.5, this follows immediately from Theorem 2.7. ■

3 Radical-power ideals.

Let D be an arbitrary Dedekind domain. A classical result states that each nonzero proper ideal I of D is a finite product of prime ideals. An application, Corollary 3.5, of the main result in this section, Theorem 3.3, shows that I extends to a radical-power ideal in a suitable finite integral extension domain E of D ; in fact, we prove that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^m$, where $m = [E_{(0)} : D_{(0)}]$. To facilitate the statement and proof of the results in this section, we use the following notation and terminology.

Notation 3.1 Let D be a Dedekind domain with quotient field $F \neq D$, let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be distinct maximal ideals of D , and let $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$ be an ideal in D , where $e_1, \dots, e_n$ are positive integers. Then:

(3.1.1) For each finite integral extension domain A of D (including D) let $\mathbf{M}_I(A) = \{N \mid N \text{ is a maximal ideal in } A \text{ and } N \cap D \in \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}\}$.

(3.1.2) Let E be a finite integral extension Dedekind domain of D and let $\mathbf{V} = \{E_N \mid N \in \mathbf{M}_I(E)\}$. If S is an m -consistent system for $\mathbf{V}$, then by abuse of terminology we sometimes say that S is an m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E)$, and when $N \in \mathbf{M}_I(E)$ we sometimes use $S(N)$ in place of $S(E_N)$.

Remark 3.2 With the notation of (3.1), let $S = \{S(M_1), \dots, S(M_n)\}$ be a realizable m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where $S(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let L be a field that realizes S for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and let E be the integral closure of D in L . Then:

(3.2.1) $[L : F] = m$, and L has distinct DVRs $(V_{i,1}, N_{i,1}), \dots, (V_{i,s_i}, N_{i,s_i})$ such that for each i, j : $V_{i,j} \cap F = D_{M_i}$; $V_{i,j}/N_{i,j}$ is D/M_i -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$; $[K_{i,j} : K_i] = f_{i,j}$, where $K_i = D/M_i$; and, $M_i V_{i,j} = N_{i,j}^{e_{i,j}}$. Also, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $V_{i,1}, \dots, V_{i,s_i}$ are all of the extensions of D_{M_i} to L , so $\mathbf{M}_I(E) = \{N_{i,j} \cap E \mid i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$.

(3.2.2) E is a Dedekind domain that is a finite separable integral extension domain of D , and $IE = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n} E = P_{1,1}^{e_1 e_{1,1}} \cdots P_{n,s_n}^{e_n e_{n,s_n}}$, where $P_{i,j} = N_{i,j} \cap E$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$.

Proof. (3.2.1) follows immediately from (a) - (c) of Definition 1.6.

For (3.2.2), E is a Dedekind domain, by [19, Theorem 19, p. 281], and E is a finite separable integral extension domain of D , by [19, Corollary 1, p. 265], since L is a finite separable algebraic extension field of F . Also, $V_{i,j} = E_{P_{i,j}}$, so $IV_{i,j} = (IE)V_{i,j} = (ID_{M_i})V_{i,j} = (M_i^{e_i} D_{M_i})V_{i,j} = (M_i V_{i,j})^{e_i} = N_{i,j}^{e_i e_{i,j}}$. Since the ideals $P_{i,j}$ are the only prime ideals in E that lie over M_i (for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$) and since the $P_{i,j}$ are comaximal, it follows that $IE = P_{1,1}^{e_1 e_{1,1}} \cdots P_{n,s_n}^{e_n e_{n,s_n}}$. ■

Theorem 3.3 is the main result of this section; it shows that every ideal I as in Notation 3.1 extends to a radical-power ideal in some finite integral extension Dedekind domain.

This theorem is proved in [10, (2.11.1)] by composing n related consistent systems. We give this different proof here since it suggests the proof of the analogous “finite-residue-field degree” result given in Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 3.3 *With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2), assume that $n > 1$. Then the system $S = \{S(M_1), \dots, S(M_n)\}$ is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $S(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$. Therefore there exists a Dedekind domain E that is a finite separable integral extension domain of D such that $[L : F] = e_1 \cdots e_n$, where L (resp., F) is the quotient field of E (resp., D), and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly e_i maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i}$ in E that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, $[(E/N_{i,j}) : (D/M_i)] = 1$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}} E_{N_{i,j}}$, so $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$.*

Proof. If $e_h = 1$ for some $h = 1, \dots, n$, then since $K_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ for all i, j , it follows that condition (1) of Definition 1.5 is satisfied, and it is readily checked that condition (2) of Definition 1.5 is satisfied with $m = e_1 \cdots e_n$, so S is an $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Since the cardinality of $S(M_h)$ is $e_h = 1$, S is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, by Theorem 2.1(i). Hence the system S is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Let L be a realization of S for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (so $[L : F] = e_1 \cdots e_n$, by (a) of Definition 1.6), and let E be the integral closure of D in L . Then E is a Dedekind domain that is a finite separable integral extension domain of D , by Remark 3.2.2, and it readily follows from either Remark 3.2.1 or the prescription given by S that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly e_i maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i}$ in E that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, $E/N_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}} E_{N_{i,j}}$, so $M_i E = \prod_{j=1}^{e_i} N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}}$. Therefore, since $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$, it follows that $IE = (M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n})E = \prod_{i=1}^n [(\prod_{j=1}^{e_i} N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}})^{e_i}]$, so $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$. Thus it may be assumed that $e_i > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Let $S_1 = \{S_1(M_1), \dots, S_1(M_n)\}$, where $S_1(M_n) = \{((D/M_n), 1, e_1 \cdots e_{n-1})\}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, $S_1(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$. Then it follows as in the preceding paragraph that S_1 is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Let L_1 be a realization of S_1 for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (so $[L_1 : F] = e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}$, by (a) of Definition 1.6), and let E_1 be the integral closure of D in L_1 , so E_1 is a Dedekind domain that is a finite separable integral extension domain of D . Also, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ there exist exactly

e_i maximal ideals $Q_{i,1}, \dots, Q_{i,e_i}$ in E_1 that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, $E_1/Q_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i(E_1)_{Q_{i,j}} = Q_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}}{e_i}}(E_1)_{Q_{i,j}}$, so $M_i E_1 = \Pi_{j=1}^{e_i} Q_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}}{e_i}}$. Further, there is a unique maximal ideal $Q_{n,1}$ in E_1 that lies over M_n , $E_1/Q_{n,1} \cong D/M_n$ and $M_n(E_1)_{Q_{n,1}} = Q_{n,1}^{e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}}(E_1)_{Q_{n,1}}$, so $M_n E_1 = Q_{n,1}^{e_1 \cdots e_{n-1}}$.

It follows that there are exactly $m' = e_1 + \cdots + e_{n-1} + 1$ ideals $Q_{1,1}, \dots, Q_{n,1}$ in $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, so let $S_2 = \{S_2(Q_{1,1}), \dots, S_2(Q_{1,e_1}), \dots, S_2(Q_{n-1,1}), \dots, S_2(Q_{n-1,e_{n-1}}), S_2(Q_{n,1})\}$, where $S_2(Q_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}, 1, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_n\}$, and for all other (i, j) , $S_2(Q_{i,j}) = \{(D/M_i), 1, e_n\}$. Then it follows as in the second preceding paragraph that S_2 is a realizable e_n -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$. Let L be a realization of S_2 for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$ (so $[L : L_1] = e_n$, by (a) of Definition 1.6, so $[L : F] = e_1 \cdots e_n$), and let E be the integral closure of E_1 in L , so E is a Dedekind domain that is a finite separable integral extension domain of E_1 , so also of D . Also, for $i = 1, \dots, m' - 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, e_i$ there exists exactly one ideal $N_{i,j}$ in $\mathbf{M}_I(E)$ that lies over $Q_{i,j}$, $E/N_{i,j} \cong E_1/Q_{i,j}$, and $Q_{i,j} E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j}^{e_n} E_{N_{i,j}}$, so $Q_{i,j} E = N_{i,j}^{e_n}$ (so it follows from the preceding paragraph that there exist exactly e_i maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i}$ in E that lie over M_i and, for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, $E/N_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}} E_{N_{i,j}}$, so $M_i E = \Pi_{j=1}^{e_i} N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}}$). And there exist exactly e_n ideals $N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,e_n}$ in $\mathbf{M}_I(E)$ that lie over $Q_{n,1}$ and, for $j = 1, \dots, e_n$, $E/N_{n,j} \cong E_1/Q_{n,1}$ and $Q_{n,1} E_{N_{n,j}} = N_{n,j}^{e_n} E_{N_{n,j}}$, so $Q_{n,1} E = \Pi_{j=1}^{e_n} N_{n,j}$ (so it follows from the preceding paragraph that there exist exactly e_n maximal ideals $N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,e_n}$ in E that lie over M_n and, for $j = 1, \dots, e_n$, $E/N_{n,j} \cong D/M_n$ and $M_n E_{N_{n,j}} = N_{n,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_n}} E_{N_{n,j}}$, so $M_n E = \Pi_{j=1}^{e_n} N_{n,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_n}}$). It follows that L is a realization of the $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system S for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, (with S as in the statement of this theorem), so S is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$.

Finally, $[(E/N_{i,j}) : (D/M_i)] = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, by the preceding paragraph, and, since $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$ and $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j}^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}} E_{N_{i,j}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, it follows that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$. ■

Remark 3.4 (3.4.1) If no prime integer divides all of the e_i in Theorem 3.3, we show in Theorem 3.11 that the exponent $e_1 \cdots e_n$ in Theorem 3.3 can be replaced by the least common multiple of the e_i . So for example if $n = 3$ and $(e_1, e_2, e_3) = (4, 6, 5)$, we get $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{60}$ instead of $(\text{Rad}(IE))^{120}$. See also Remark 3.12.

(3.4.2) With the notation of Theorem 3.3, let d be a common multiple of $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$ and let $d^* = de_n$. (Thus, for example, if $e_1 = \dots = e_{n-1}$, then $d^* = e_1 e_n$ is (depending on e_1 and n) potentially considerably smaller than $e_1 \dots e_n$.) Then the following d^* -consistent system S^* is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$: $S^* = \{S^*(M_1), \dots, S^*(M_n)\}$ with $S^*(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{d^*}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Also, $IE^* = (\text{Rad}(IE^*))^{d^*}$, where E^* is the integral closure of D is a realization of S^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$.

Proof. For (3.4.2), the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 3.3 by composing the following two realizable consistent systems S_1^*, S_2^* . Here, $S_1^* = \{S_1^*(M_1), \dots, S_1^*(M_n)\}$ with $S_1^*(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{d^*}{e_i e_n}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, and $S_1^*(M_n) = \{((D/M_n), 1, \frac{d^*}{e_n})\}$, so S_1^* is a realizable $\frac{d^*}{e_n}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Let E_1^* be the integral closure of D is a realization L_1^* of S_1^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, and for $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $Q_{i,1}, \dots, Q_{i,e_i}$ be the maximal ideals in E_1 that lie over M_i . Let

$$S_2^* = \{S_2^*(Q_{1,1}), \dots, S_2^*(Q_{n-1,e_{n-1}}), S_2^*(Q_{n,1})\}$$

with $S_2^*(Q_{i,j}) = \{((D/M_i), 1, e_i)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, e_i$, and $S_2^*(Q_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}, 1, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_n\}$, so S_2^* is a realizable e_n -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$. ■

The following corollary is essentially given in [10, (2.10)], except for the exponent $e_1 \dots e_n$ that occurs here by using Theorem 3.3.

Corollary 3.5 *Let $I = M_1^{e_1} \cap \dots \cap M_n^{e_n}$ be an irredundant primary decomposition of the nonzero proper ideal I of the Dedekind domain D . Then there exists a finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of D such that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^m$, where $m = e_1 \dots e_n$.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, then $I = M_1^{e_1} = (\text{Rad}(I))^{e_1}$, so the conclusion holds with $E = D$ and $m = e_1$. If $n > 1$, then the conclusion follows immediately from Theorem 3.3, since $I = M_1^{e_1} \cap \dots \cap M_n^{e_n} = M_1^{e_1} \dots M_n^{e_n}$. ■

Corollary 3.6 *Let $k = \pi_1^{e_1} \dots \pi_n^{e_n}$ be the factorization of the positive integer $k > 1$ as a product of distinct prime integers π_i . . Then there exists an extension field L of $\mathbb{Q}$ of degree $e_1 \dots e_n$ such that $kE = [\prod_{i=1}^n (\prod_{j=1}^{e_i} p_{i,j})]^{e_1 \dots e_n}$, where E is the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in L and $\mathbf{M}_{k\mathbb{Z}}(E) = \{p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{n,e_n}\}$.*

Remark 3.7 shows that I sometimes extends to a radical power ideal in a simpler realizable consistent system.

Remark 3.7 With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2), assume² that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exists a simple algebraic extension field $K_i^{(1)}$ of D/M_i such that $[K_i^{(1)} : (D/M_i)] = e_i$. Then the system $S^{(1)} = \{S^{(1)}(M_1), \dots, S^{(1)}(M_n)\}$, where $S^{(1)}(M_i) = \{(K_i^{(1)}, e_i, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i})\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, is an $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. By Theorem 2.1(i), it is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Also, if E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of $S^{(1)}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, then $IE = J^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$, where $J = \text{Rad}(IE)$. More specifically, since E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of $S^{(1)}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exists a unique maximal ideal N_i in E that lies over M_i , and then $E/N_i \cong K_i^{(1)}$ and $M_i E_{N_i} = N_i^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}} E_{N_i}$, so $M_i E = N_i^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}}$, so $IE = (\prod_{i=1}^n M_i^{e_i})E = \prod_{i=1}^n (N_i^{\frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}})^{e_i} = J^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$, where $J = N_1 \cdots N_n$.

Remark 3.8 Let $V_i = D_{M_i}$ and $S = \{S(V_1), \dots, S(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D) = \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $S(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$. If we consider the s_i , $K_{i,j}$, and $f_{i,j}$ as fixed in the m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and the $e_{i,j}$ as variables subject to the constraint $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j} = m$ for each i , then S gives a map $\mathbb{N}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+^t$ (where $t = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i$) defined by

$$(e_1, \dots, e_n) \mapsto (e_1 e_{1,1}, \dots, e_1 e_{1,s_1}, \dots, e_n e_{n,1}, \dots, e_n e_{n,s_n}).$$

If we are only interested in the projective equivalence class of IE , it seems appropriate to consider the induced map given by $S : \mathbb{N}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^t(\mathbb{N}_+) = \mathbb{N}_+^t / \sim$, where $(a_1, \dots, a_t) \sim (b_1, \dots, b_t)$ if $(a_1, \dots, a_t) = (cb_1, \dots, cb_t)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. In this case, Theorem 2.3 shows that the equations $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j} = m$ are the only restrictions on the image of this map into $\mathbf{P}^t(\mathbb{N}_+)$. From this point of view, if we want an equation $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^k$ for some finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of D and for some positive integer k , then it is not necessary to compose two realizable consistent systems, as in the proof of Theorem 3.3. Indeed, it suffices to observe that we have an m -consistent system $S = \{S(M_1), \dots, S(M_n)\}$, where $m = e_1 \cdots e_n$ and $S(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (realizable or not), and then apply Theorem 2.3.

² D may have a residue field D/M_i that has no extension field $K_i^{(1)}$ with $[K_i^{(1)} : (D/M_i)] = e_i$; for example, D/M_i may be algebraically closed, see also Example 3 in [15].

To extend Theorem 3.3 to ideals in Noetherian domains of altitude one, we use the following result from [10].

Proposition 3.9 [10, (2.6)] *Let R be a Noetherian domain of altitude one with quotient field F , let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let L be a finite algebraic extension field of F , let E be the integral closure of R in L , and assume there exist distinct maximal ideals $N_1, \dots, N_n$ of E and positive integers $k_1, \dots, k_n, h$ such that $IE = (N_1^{k_1} \dots N_n^{k_n})^h$. Then there exists a finite integral extension domain A of R with quotient field L and distinct maximal ideals $P_1, \dots, P_n$ of A such that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$:*

- (i) $P_i E = N_i$.
- (ii) $E/N_i \cong A/P_i$.
- (iii) $(IA)_a = ((P_1^{k_1} \dots P_n^{k_n})^h)_a$.

The following corollary is the same as [10, (2.8.2)], except for the explicit exponent $e_1 \dots e_n$ given here.

Corollary 3.10 *Let R be a Noetherian domain of altitude one, let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let R' be the integral closure of R in its quotient field, and let $IR' = M_1^{e_1} \dots M_n^{e_n}$ be a normal primary decomposition of IR' . Then there exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R such that $(IA)_a = ((\text{Rad}(IA))^{e_1 \dots e_n})_a$, and if A' denotes the integral closure of A in its quotient field, then for each $P \in \mathbf{M}_I(A)$ we have: (i) PA' is a maximal ideal, and (ii) $A'/PA' \cong A/P$.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, then $IR' = (\text{Rad}(IR'))^{e_1}$ and R' is a Dedekind domain, so the conclusion follows from Proposition 3.9.

If $n > 1$, then by hypothesis there are exactly n distinct maximal ideals $M_1, \dots, M_n$ in R' that contain IR' and $IR' = M_1^{e_1} \dots M_n^{e_n}$. Also, R' is a Dedekind domain, so by Theorem 3.3 there exists a finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of R' such that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \dots e_n}$. Then E is the integral closure of R in the quotient field of E ; the conclusions follow from this, together with Proposition 3.9. ■

An additional way to compose realizable consistent systems to obtain a Dedekind domain E as in Theorem 3.3 is discussed in [10, (2.11.2)]. We consider [10, (2.11.2)] again here in Proposition 3.11 because we want to add an observation on the exponent $e_1 \cdots e_n$. It gives a different inductive way to prove Theorem 3.3 when the exponents $e_1, \dots, e_n$ have no common integer prime divisors and replaces the exponent and degree $e_1 \cdots e_n$ in Theorem 3.3 with a smaller exponent and degree d . This also gives corresponding different versions of Corollaries 3.6 and 3.10. In case the exponents $e_1, \dots, e_n$ do have common integer prime divisors, see Remark 3.12.

Proposition 3.11 *With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2), assume that $n > 1$ and that no prime integer divides each e_i . Let $d = p_1^{m_1} \cdots p_k^{m_k}$ be the least common multiple of $e_1, \dots, e_n$, where $p_1, \dots, p_k$ are distinct prime integers and $m_1, \dots, m_k$ are positive integers. Then the system $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{S}(M_1), \dots, \mathbf{S}(M_n)\}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $\mathbf{S}(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{d}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$, is a realizable d -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Also, if E is the integral closure of D in a realization L of $\mathbf{S}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, then $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^d$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of [10, (2.11.1)]. There exists a chain of rings

$$(*) \quad D = E_{(0)} \subset E_1 \subset \cdots \subset E_k = E,$$

where each E_h ($h = 1, \dots, k$) is the integral closure of E_{h-1} in a realization L_h of a realizable $p_h^{m_h}$ -consistent system $\mathbf{S}_h$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_{h-1})$. To describe the consistent systems used to obtain these rings E_h we first need the factorizations of each e_i . So, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $e_i = p_1^{c_{i,1}} \cdots p_k^{c_{i,k}}$, so $0 \leq c_{i,j} \leq m_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$, since $d = p_1^{m_1} \cdots p_k^{m_k}$. With this notation, it will now be shown that, for $h = 1, \dots, k$, E_h has, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, exactly $t_{h,i} = p_1^{c_{i,1}} \cdots p_h^{c_{i,h}}$ maximal ideals $P_{i,1}, \dots, P_{i,t_{h,i}}$ that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, t_{h,i}$, $E_h/P_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i(E_h)_{P_{i,j}} = P_{i,j}^{r_{h,i}}(E_h)_{P_{i,j}}$, where $r_{h,i} = p_1^{m_1 - c_{i,1}} \cdots p_h^{m_h - c_{i,h}}$.

For the first step, let $e_i = p_1^{c_{i,1}} d_{i,1}$ with $p_1 \nmid d_{i,1}$, so $0 \leq c_{i,1} \leq m_1$ for each i . It may be assumed that $c_{1,1} \geq c_{2,1} \geq \cdots \geq c_{n,1}$ (so $c_{1,1} = m_1$ and $c_{n,1} = 0$ (by the hypothesis that no prime divides all e_i)), and let $\mathbf{S}_1 = \{\mathbf{S}_1(M_1), \dots, \mathbf{S}_1(M_n)\}$, where $\mathbf{S}_1(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, p_1^{m_1 - c_{i,1}}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i = p_1^{c_{i,1}}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $\mathbf{S}_1$ is a $p_1^{m_1}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, and since $c_{n,1} = 0$, it is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Let E_1 be the integral clo-

sure of D in a realization L_1 of $\mathbf{S}_1$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Then by Remark 3.2.2, $IE_1 = \prod_{i=1}^n (M_i^{e_i} E_1)$

$$(**) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n (N_{i,1}^{e_i e_{i,1}} \dots N_{i,s_i}^{e_i e_{i,s_i}}) = \prod_{i=1}^n (N_{i,1}^{(p_1^{c_{i,1}} d_{i,1})(p_1^{m_1 - c_{i,1}})} \dots N_{i,s_i}^{(p_1^{c_{i,1}} d_{i,1})(p_1^{m_1 - c_{i,1}})}) = J_1 p_1^{m_1},$$

where $J_1 = \prod_{i=1}^n (N_{i,1}^{d_{i,1}} \dots N_{i,s_i}^{d_{i,1}})$, and $\prod_{i=1}^n d_{i,1}^{s_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n d_{i,1}^{p_1^{c_{i,1}}}$ has $p_2, \dots, p_k$ as its prime integer factors.

Assume that $h > 1$ and that E_{h-1} has been constructed to have the properties in the second preceding paragraph, so, in particular, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $\mathbf{M}_I(E_{h-1})$ has exactly $t_{h-1,i}$ maximal ideals $P_{i,1}, \dots, P_{i,t_{h-1,i}}$ that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, t_{h-1,i}$, $E_{h-1}/P_{i,j} \cong D/M_i$ and $M_i(E_{h-1})_{P_{i,j}} = P_{i,j}^{r_{h-1,i}}(E_{h-1})_{P_{i,j}}$.

To get E_h from E_{h-1} , let $\mathbf{S}_h = \{\mathbf{S}_h(P_{1,1}), \dots, \mathbf{S}_h(P_{n,t_{h-1,n}})\}$, where

$$\mathbf{S}_h(P_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j,l}, 1, p_h^{m_h - c_{i,h}}) \mid l = 1, \dots, p_h^{c_{i,h}}\} \text{ for all } i, j.$$

Then it is readily checked that $\mathbf{S}_h$ is a $p_h^{m_h}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_{h-1})$, and it is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_{h-1})$, by Theorem 2.1(i). It then follows from the prescription of $\mathbf{S}_h$ that the integral closure E_h of E_{h-1} in a realization L_h of $\mathbf{S}_h$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_{h-1})$ has the properties of E_h in the third preceding paragraph.

It therefore follows that $[L : F] = p_1^{m_1} \dots p_k^{m_k} = d$, where L (resp. F) is the quotient field of $E = E_k$ (resp., $D = E_{(0)}$) and that E is a realization of the system $\mathbf{S}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (with $\mathbf{S}$ as in the statement of this theorem), so $\mathbf{S}$ is a realizable d -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Finally, it follows from (**), applied in each of the k steps, that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^d$.

■

Remark 3.12 Concerning the hypothesis in Proposition 3.11 that no prime integer divides all e_i , if, on the contrary, π is a prime integer that divides each e_i , then let c be the greatest common divisor of $e_1, \dots, e_n$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ define k_i by $e_i = ck_i$, and let $I_0 = M_1^{k_1} \dots M_n^{k_n}$, so $I_0^c = (\prod_{i=1}^n M_i^{k_i})^c = \prod_{i=1}^n M_i^{e_i} = I$ and no prime integer divides all k_i . Therefore, if the ring E of Theorem 3.3 is constructed for I_0 in place of I , then $I_0 E = (\text{Rad}(I_0 E))^d$, where d is the least common multiple of $k_1, \dots, k_n$, so $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{dc}$.

Theorem 3.3 shows that there exist finite separable integral extension domains E of D such that IE is a radical-power ideal. Proposition 3.13 characterizes the conditions a

realizable m -consistent system S' for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ must satisfy in order that $IE = J^t$ for some radical ideal J in E and for some positive integer t .

Proposition 3.13 *Let D be a Dedekind domain with quotient field $F \neq D$, let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ ($n > 1$) be distinct maximal ideals of D , let $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$ be an ideal in D , where $e_1, \dots, e_n$ are positive integers, and let m be a positive integer. Let $S' = \{S'(M_1), \dots, S'(M_n)\}$ be a realizable m -consistent system for $\{D_{M_1}, \dots, D_{M_n}\}$, where $S'(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let E be the integral closure of D in a finite separable field extension L of F which realizes S' for $\{D_{M_1}, \dots, D_{M_n}\}$, so $[L : F] = m$. Then the following hold:*

(3.13.1) *$IE = J^t$ for some radical ideal J in E and for some positive integer t if and only if the products $e_i e_{i,j}$ are equal for all i, j , and then $J = \text{Rad}(IE)$ and $e_i e_{i,j} = t$.*

(3.13.2) *If $IE = J^m$ (as in Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.11), then $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} f_{i,j} = e_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

(3.13.3) *If $IE = J^t$, as in (3.13.1), and if no prime integer divides each e_i , then m is a positive multiple of t and t (and hence m) is a positive multiple of each e_i .*

Proof. For (3.13.1), it is clear that if $IE = J^t$ for some radical ideal J in E , then $J = \text{Rad}(IE)$. Therefore let $J = \text{Rad}(IE) = P_1 \cdots P_k$, for distinct prime ideals $P_1, \dots, P_k$ of E . Then by Remark 3.2, $IE = \prod_{i=1}^n (P_{i,1}^{e_i e_{i,1}} \cdots P_{i,s_i}^{e_i e_{i,s_i}})$. Thus by uniqueness of primary decompositions in a Dedekind domain, it follows that $J^t = IE$ if and only if $t = e_i e_{i,j}$ for each i and j , hence (3.13.1) holds.

For (3.13.2), by (2) in the definition of a consistent system we have $m = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore if (3.13.1) holds and if $t = m$ ($= [L : F]$), then $m = t = e_i e_{i,j}$ for all i, j , so $e_{i,j} = \frac{m}{e_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$. Substituting $\frac{m}{e_i}$ for $e_{i,j}$ and multiplying by e_i we get $m e_i = m \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} f_{i,j}$ for each i , so the conclusion follows by cancelling m .

For (3.13.3), if (3.13.1) holds, then as in the proof of (3.13.2) we have $e_{i,j} = \frac{t}{e_i}$ for all i, j and $m = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j}$ for all i . Substituting $\frac{t}{e_i}$ for $e_{i,j}$ and multiplying by e_i we get $m e_i = t \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} f_{i,j}$ for each i . Since no prime divides each e_i , we get $m = t m'$ for some $m' \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Therefore, since $t = e_i e_{i,j}$ for all i, j , t and m are positive multiples of each e_i . ■

4 Finite-residue-field degree analogs.

Under the assumption that each of the residue fields D/M_i is finite, the results in this section are “finite-residue-field degree” analogs of the results in Section 3. Theorem 4.1 is the main result in this section; it is a finite-residue-field degree analog of Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 4.1 *With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2), assume that $n > 1$ and that each $K_i = D/M_i$ is finite. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let f_i be a positive integer such that $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$ for some subfield F_i of K_i , and let $K_i' \subseteq \overline{K_i}$ be the unique extension field of K_i of degree $\frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}$, where $\overline{K_i}$ is a fixed algebraic closure of K_i . Then the system $T = \{T(M_1), \dots, T(M_n)\}$ is a realizable m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where $m = f_1 \cdots f_n$ and $T(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (with $K_{i,j} = K_i'$ for $j = 1, \dots, f_i$). Therefore there exists a Dedekind domain E that is a finite separable integral extension domain of D such that $[L : F] = m$ (where L (resp., F) is the quotient field of E (resp., D)) and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly f_i maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,f_i}$ in E that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j} E_{N_{i,j}}$ and $[(E/N_{i,j}) : K_i] = \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}$, so $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = m$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3. Specifically, if $f_h = 1$ for some $h = 1, \dots, n$, then $T(M_h)$ has $s_h = f_h = 1$, so the system T is a realizable $f_1 \cdots f_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, by Theorem 2.1(i), and the integral closure E of D in a realization L of T for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ has the desired properties, so it may be assumed that $f_i > 1$ for all i . Then the desired ring E is obtained by composing the following two systems T_1 (to get the Dedekind domain E_1 from D) and T_2 (to get the Dedekind domain E from E_1). Here, $T_1 = \{T_1(M_1), \dots, T_1(M_n)\}$, where $T_1(M_n) = \{(K_{n,1}, f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}, 1)\}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, $T_1(M_i) = \{(H_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}}{f_i}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ (with $K_i \subseteq H_{i,j} \subseteq K_{i,j}$; such $H_{i,j}$ exist, by Remark 2.6.1, so $[K_{i,j} : H_{i,j}] = f_n$). It follows from Theorem 2.1(i) that T_1 is a realizable $f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and that there are exactly $m' = f_1 + \cdots + f_{n-1} + 1$ ideals $Q_{1,1}, \dots, Q_{n-1,f_{n-1}}, Q_{n,1}$ in $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, where E_1 is the integral closure of D in a realization L_1 of T_1 for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Therefore let $T_2 = \{T_2(Q_{1,1}), \dots, T_2(Q_{1,f_1}), \dots, T_2(Q_{n-1,1}), \dots, T_2(Q_{n-1,f_{n-1}}), T_2(Q_{n,1})\}$, where $T_2(Q_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}, 1, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_n\}$, and for all other (i, j) , $T_2(Q_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_n, 1)\}$. (Note that, by hypothesis, $E_1/Q_{n,1} \cong K_{n,1} = \cdots = K_{n,f_n}$.) It follows that T_2 is a f_n -consistent system

for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, and it is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, by Theorem 2.1(i). Let E be the integral closure of E_1 in a realization of T_2 for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$. Then the $E/N_{n,j}$ are $E_1/Q_{n,1}$ -isomorphic to $K_{n,j}$ and $E_1/Q_{n,1} \supseteq K_n$, so the $E/N_{n,j}$ are K_n -isomorphic to $K_{n,j} = K_{n,1} = K_n'$. Also, by construction, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, $E/N_{i,j}$ is $E_1/Q_{i,j}$ -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$ and $E/Q_{i,j} \supseteq K_i$, so $E/N_{i,j}$ is K_i -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$. Further, the $K_{i,j}$ are finite and contain K_i , so they are simple extensions of K_i . Therefore it follows as in the third paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.3 that a realization L of T_2 for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$ is, in fact, a realization of T for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (with T as in the statement of this theorem), so T is a realizable $f_1 \cdots f_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$.

Finally, it follows from the prescription given by T that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j} E_{N_{i,j}}$ and $[(E/N_{i,j}) : K_i] = \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}$, so $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$. ■

Remark 4.2 (4.2.1) The hypothesis in Theorem 4.1 that each $K_i = D_i/M_i$ is finite is often not essential. Specifically, if the set of extension fields of the K_i have the following properties (a) - (c), then it follows from the proof of Theorem 4.1 that the conclusion holds, even though the K_i are not finite: (a) For $i = 1, \dots, n$, K_i has a subfield F_i such that $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$. (b) With $m = f_1 \cdots f_n$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ K_i has (not necessarily distinct) simple extension fields $K_{i,1}, \dots, K_{i,f_i}$ such that $[K_{i,j} : K_i] = \frac{m}{f_i}$. (c) For $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, K_i has simple extension fields $H_{i,j}$ such that $[H_{i,j} : K_i] = \frac{f_1 \cdots f_{n-1}}{f_i}$ and such that $H_{i,j} \subseteq K_{i,j}$ (so $[K_{i,j} : H_{i,j}] = f_n$).

(4.2.2) With the notation of Theorem 4.1, let d be a common multiple of $f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}$ and let $d^* = df_n$. (Thus, for example, if $f_1 = \cdots = f_{n-1}$, then $d^* = f_1 f_n$ is (depending on f_1 and n) potentially considerably smaller than $f_1 \cdots f_n$.) Then the following d^* -consistent system T^* is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$: $T^* = \{T^*(M_1), \dots, T^*(M_n)\}$ with $T^*(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{d^*}{f_i}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (with $K_{i,j} = K_i'^*$ for $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, where $K_i'^* \subseteq \overline{K_i}$ is the unique extension field of K_i of degree d^*). Also, $[E^*/N_{i,j} : F_i] = d^*$ for all i, j , where E^* is the integral closure of D is a realization of T^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$.

Proof. For (4.2.2), the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 3.3 by composing the following two realizable consistent systems T_1^*, T_2^* . Here, $T_1^* = \{T_1^*(M_1), \dots, T_1^*(M_n)\}$ with $T_1^*(M_i) = \{(H_{i,j}, \frac{d^*}{f_i f_n}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ (with $K_i \subseteq H_{i,j} \subseteq K_{i,j}$,

so $[K_{i,j} : H_{i,j}] = f_n$, and $T_1^*(M_n) = \{(K_{n,1}, \frac{d^*}{f_n}, 1)\}$, so T_1^* is a realizable $\frac{d^*}{f_n}$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Let E_1^* be the integral closure of D is a realization L_1^* of T_1^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, and for $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $Q_{i,1}, \dots, Q_{i,f_i}$ be the maximal ideals in E_1 that lie over M_i . Let $T_2^* = \{T_2^*(Q_{1,1}), \dots, T_2^*(Q_{n-1,f_{n-1}}), T_2^*(Q_{n,1})\}$ with $T_2^*(Q_{i,j}) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_n, 1)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, and $T_2^*(Q_{n,1}) = \{(K_{n,j}, 1, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_n\}$, so T_2^* is a realizable f_n -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$. ■

Corollary 4.3 is a special case of Theorem 4.1; it is a finite-residue-field degree analog of Corollary 3.6.

Corollary 4.3 *Let D be the ring of integers of an algebraic number field F and let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ ($n > 1$) be distinct maximal ideals in D . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $\mathbb{Z}/\pi_i\mathbb{Z}$ be the prime subfield of D/M_i (possibly $\pi_i = \pi_j$ for some $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$) and let $f_i = [(D/M_i) : (\mathbb{Z}/\pi_i\mathbb{Z})]$. Then there exists a Dedekind domain E that is a finite (separable) integral extension domain of D such that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly f_i maximal ideals $p_{i,j}$ in E that lie over M_i , and then, for $j = 1, \dots, f_i$, $M_i E_{p_{i,j}} = p_{i,j} E_{p_{i,j}}$ and $[(E/p_{i,j}) : (\mathbb{Z}/\pi_i\mathbb{Z})] = f_1 \cdots f_n$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 4.1. ■

Remark 4.4 corresponds to Remark 3.8.

Remark 4.4 Let D be a Dedekind domain with quotient field $F \neq D$, let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be distinct maximal ideals of D , and assume that D/M_i is finite for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let f_i be a positive integer, and assume there exists a subfield F_i of D/M_i such that $[(D/M_i) : F_i] = f_i$. Let $T = \{T(V_1), \dots, T(V_n)\}$ be an arbitrary m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D) = \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $T(V_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$. If we consider the s_i , $K_{i,j}$, and $e_{i,j}$ as fixed in the m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and the $f_{i,j}$ as variables subject to the constraint $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j} = m$ for each i , then T gives a map $\mathbb{N}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+^t$ (where $t = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i$) defined by

$$(f_1, \dots, f_n) \mapsto (f_1 f_{1,1}, \dots, f_1 f_{1,s_1}, \dots, f_n f_{n,1}, \dots, f_n f_{n,s_n}),$$

and Theorem 2.7 shows that the equations $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j} = m$ are the only restrictions on the image of the induced map $S : \mathbb{N}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^t(\mathbb{N}_+) = \mathbb{N}_+^t / \sim$, where $(a_1, \dots, a_t) \sim (b_1, \dots, b_t)$ if

$(a_1, \dots, a_t) = (cb_1, \dots, cb_t)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. From this point of view, if we want an equation $[(E/Q_{i,j}) : F_i] = k$ for all i, j , for some finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of D and for some positive integer k , then it is not necessary to compose two realizable consistent systems, as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Indeed, it suffices to observe that we have an m -consistent system $T = \{T(M_1), \dots, T(M_n)\}$, where $m = f_1 \cdots f_n$ and $T(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, 1) \mid j = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (realizable or not), and then apply Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 4.5 is a finite-residue-field degree analog of Corollary 3.10. Since hypotheses on infinite residue fields can sometimes be replaced by the hypotheses that the residue fields have cardinality greater than or equal to a given positive integer, Corollary 4.5 may be useful in this regard.

Corollary 4.5 *Let R be a Noetherian domain of altitude one, let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let R' be the integral closure of R in its quotient field, let $IR' = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$ ($n > 1$) be a normal primary decomposition of IR' , and for $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $[(R'/M_i) : (R/(M_i \cap R))] = g_i$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ assume that R'/M_i is finite, let f_i be a positive integer, and assume that $[(R/(M_i \cap R)) : F_i] = f_i$, where F_i is a subfield of $R/(M_i \cap R)$. Then there exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R such that, for all $P \in \mathbf{M}_I(A)$, $[(A/P) : F_i] = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i g_i = [A_{(0)} : R_{(0)}]$. Also, A may be chosen so that, with A' the integral closure of A in $A_{(0)}$, there exist exactly $f_i g_i$ maximal ideals $P_{i,j}$ in A such that $P_{i,j} A' \cap R' = M_i$ and, for all $P \in \mathbf{M}_I(A)$ it holds that $PA' \in \mathbf{M}_I(A')$ and $A/P \cong A'/(PA')$.*

Proof. Since R' is a Dedekind domain and $[(R'/M_i) : F_i] = f_i g_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, it follows from Theorem 4.1 that there exists a Dedekind domain E that is a finite separable integral extension domain of R' such that $[A_{(0)} : R_{(0)}] = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i g_i$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly $f_i g_i$ maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,f_i g_i}$ in E that lie over M_i and, for $j = 1, \dots, f_i g_i$, $M_i E_{N_{i,j}} = N_{i,j} E_{N_{i,j}}$ and $[(E/N_{i,j}) : (R'/M_i)] = \frac{f_1 g_1 \cdots f_n g_n}{f_i g_i}$, so $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i g_i$. The conclusions follow from this, together with Proposition 3.9. ■

Part of Theorem 4.1 shows that if each residue field D/M_i is finite and F_i is a subfield of D/M_i such that $[(D/M_i) : F_i] = f_i$, then there exists a finite separable integral extension

domain E of D such that $[E_{(0)} : D_{(0)}] = [(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$ for all i, j ($= m$, say). Proposition 4.6 characterizes the conditions a realizable m -consistent system T' for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ must satisfy in order that $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$ for all i, j .

Proposition 4.6 *Let D be a Dedekind domain with quotient field $F \neq D$, let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ ($n > 1$) be distinct maximal ideals of D , and assume that $K_i = D/M_i$ is finite for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let f_i be a positive integer such that $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$ for some subfield F_i of K_i . Let m be a positive integer and let $T' = \{T'(M_1), \dots, T'(M_n)\}$ be a realizable m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $T'(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$, and let E be the integral closure of D in a realization L of T' for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, so $[L : F] = m$. Then the following hold:*

(4.6.1) *There exists a positive integer t such that $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = t$ for all i, j if and only if the products $f_i f_{i,j}$ are equal for all i, j , and then $t = f_i f_{i,j}$.*

(4.6.2) *If $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = m$ for all i, j (as in Theorem 4.1), then $\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} = f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

(4.6.3) *If $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = t$ for all i, j , as in (4.6.1), and if no prime integer divides each f_i , then m is a positive multiple of t and t (and hence m) is a positive multiple of each f_i .*

Proof. For (4.6.1), by hypothesis $[(E/N_{i,j}) : K_i] = f_{i,j}$ and $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$ for all i, j , so it follows that $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = t$ for all i, j if and only if $f_i f_{i,j} = t$ for all i, j , hence (4.6.1) holds.

For (4.6.2), by (2) in the definition of a consistent system we have $m = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore if (4.6.1) holds and if $t = m$ ($= [L : F]$), then $m = t = f_i f_{i,j}$ for all i, j , so $f_{i,j} = \frac{m}{f_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, s_i$. Substituting $\frac{m}{f_i}$ for $f_{i,j}$ and multiplying by f_i we get $m f_i = m \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j}$ for each i , so the conclusion follows by cancelling m .

For (4.6.3), if (4.6.1) holds, then as in the proof of (4.6.2) we have $f_{i,j} = \frac{t}{f_i}$ for all i, j and $m = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j} f_{i,j}$ for all i . Substituting $\frac{t}{f_i}$ for $f_{i,j}$ and multiplying by f_i we get $m f_i = t \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j}$ for each i . Since no prime integer divides each f_i , we get $m = t m'$ for some $m' \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Therefore, since $t = f_i f_{i,j}$ for all i, j , t and m are positive multiples of each f_i . ■

5 Finite residue fields and radical-power ideals.

Theorem 5.1 is the main result in this section; it combines the main theorems of the preceding two sections.

Theorem 5.1 *With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2) (so $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$, where $n > 1$ and the e_i are positive integers), assume that each $K_i = D/M_i$ is finite and let $\overline{K_i}$ be a fixed algebraic closure of K_i . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ let f_i be a positive integer such that K_i is an extension field of a subfield F_i with $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$, and let K_i^* be the unique extension field of K_i of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n f_1 \cdots f_n$ that is contained in $\overline{K_i}$. Then the system $U = \{U(M_1), \dots, U(M_n)\}$ is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n f_1 \cdots f_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $U(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i} \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i\}$ (with $K_{i,j} = K_i^*$ for $j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i$). Therefore there exists a separable algebraic extension field L of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n f_1 \cdots f_n$ over the quotient field F of D , and a finite integral extension Dedekind domain E of D with quotient field L such that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there are exactly $e_i f_i$ maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i f_i}$ in E that lie over M_i , and it holds that $[(E/N_{i,j}) : F_i] = f_1 \cdots f_n$ for all i and j , and $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n} = (N_{1,1} \cdots N_{n,e_n f_n})^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$.*

Proof. Let $S^* = \{S^*(M_1), \dots, S^*(M_n)\}$, where $S^*(M_i) = \{(G_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (with $G_{i,j} = K_i$ for all i, j). Then S^* is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, by Theorem 3.3. Let L_1 be a realization of S^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (so L_1 is a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n$), and let E_1 be the integral closure of D in L_1 . Thus by Theorem 3.3, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exist exactly e_i maximal ideals $Q_{i,1}, \dots, Q_{i,e_i}$ in E_1 that lie over M_i , $IE_1 = (Q_{1,1} \cdots Q_{n,e_n})^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$, and $E_1/Q_{i,j}$ is K_i -isomorphic to K_i .

Let $T^* = \{T^*(Q_{1,1}), \dots, T^*(Q_{n,e_n})\}$, where $T^*(Q_{i,j}) = \{(H_{i,j,k}, \frac{f_1 \cdots f_n}{f_i}, 1) \mid k = 1, \dots, f_i\}$ for all i, j (where $H_{i,j,k}$ is one of the $e_i f_i$ ideals $K_{i,j}$ in the set $U(M_i)$). Then T^* is a realizable $f_1 \cdots f_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, by Theorem 4.1. Let L be a realization of T^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$ (so L is a separable algebraic extension field of L_1 of degree $f_1 \cdots f_n$, so L is a separable algebraic extension field of F of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n f_1 \cdots f_n$), and let E be the integral closure of E_1 in L . Thus by Theorem 4.1, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, e_n$

there exist exactly f_i maximal ideals $N_{i,j,1}, \dots, N_{i,j,f_i}$ in E that lie over $Q_{i,j}$ (so by resubscripting there are exactly $e_i f_i$ maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i f_i}$ in E that lie over M_i), $IE_1 = (N_{1,1} \cdots N_{n,e_n f_n})^{e_1 \cdots e_n} *$, and it is readily checked that $E/N_{i,j}$ is K_i -isomorphic to $K_{i,j}$. Therefore E is a Dedekind domain that has exactly $e_i f_i$ maximal ideals that lie over M_i (for $i = 1, \dots, n$) and that have the ramification and residue field extension properties that are specified by U (with U as in the statement of this theorem). Therefore L is a realization of U for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, so U is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n f_1 \cdots f_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and E is the integral closure of D in L and has the properties prescribed by U . ■

Remark 5.2 It is readily seen that, alternately, Theorem 5.1 could be proved by first applying Theorem 4.1 to D to obtain a finite integral extension Dedekind domain E_2 of D with the desired residue field extension properties and no ramification of any $M_1, \dots, M_n$, and then apply Theorem 3.3 to E_2 to yield the desired Dedekind domain, say E' .

Proposition 5.3 is related to Theorem 5.1, but does not follow immediately from it. It does not require the residue fields D/M_i to be finite, but it does require they have a finite extension of a specific degree.

Proposition 5.3 *With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2), assume that $n > 1$ and that D/M_i has a simple algebraic extension field H_i of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the $(e_1 \cdots e_n)^2$ -consistent system $S^* = \{S^*(M_1), \dots, S^*(M_n)\}$ for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, where $S^*(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, e_1 \cdots e_n, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (where $K_{i,j}$ is (D/M_i) -isomorphic to H_i). Therefore there exists a separable algebraic extension field L of the quotient field F of D of degree $(e_1 \cdots e_n)^2$ and a finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of D with quotient field L such that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there are exactly e_i maximal ideals $N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,e_i}$ in E that lie over M_i , $[(E/N_{i,j}) : (D/M_i)] = e_1 \cdots e_n$ for all i and j , and $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$.*

Proof. Let $T = \{T(M_1), \dots, T(M_n)\}$, where $T(M_i) = \{(H_i, e_1 \cdots e_n, 1)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then T is realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, by Theorem 2.1(i), so the integral closure E_1 of D in a realization L_1 of T for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ has a unique maximal ideal N_i that lies over M_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and then E_1/N_i is D/M_i -isomorphic to H_i and $M_i E_1 =$

N_i . Let $S = \{S(N_1), \dots, S(N_n)\}$, where $S(N_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, 1, \frac{e_1 \cdots e_n}{e_i}) \mid j = 1, \dots, e_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (so the $K_{i,j}$ are (A/M_i) -isomorphic to H_i for $j = 1, \dots, e_i$). Then S is a realizable $e_1 \cdots e_n$ -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$, by Theorem 3.3 applied to $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$. Therefore it is readily checked that the integral closure E of E_1 in a realization L of S for $\mathbf{M}_I(E_1)$ has the properties prescribed by S^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ (with S^* as in the statement of this theorem). Therefore L is a realization of S^* for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$, so S^* is realizable for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. ■

If Proposition 5.3 is applied to $D = \mathbb{Z}$ and $I = 72\mathbb{Z}$, for example, then it follows that there exists a field L of degree 36 over $\mathbb{Q}$ such that the integral closure E of $\mathbb{Z}$ in L has exactly three maximal ideals $p_{1,1}, p_{1,2}, p_{1,3}$ that lie over $2\mathbb{Z}$ and exactly two maximal ideals $p_{2,1}, p_{2,2}$ that lie over $3\mathbb{Z}$, $72E = (p_{1,1}p_{1,2}p_{1,3}p_{2,1}p_{2,2})^6$, $[(E/p_{1,j}) : (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})] = 6$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $[(E/p_{2,j}) : (\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})] = 6$ for $j = 1, 2$.

Corollary 5.4 *Let R be a Noetherian domain of altitude one, let I be a nonzero proper ideal in R , let R' be the integral closure of R in its quotient field, let $IR' = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$ ($n > 1$) be a normal primary decomposition of IR' .*

(5.4.1) *Assume that R'/M_i is finite for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $[(R'/M_i) : (R/(M_i \cap R))] = g_i$, and let f_i be a positive integer such that $[(R/(M_i \cap R)) : F_i] = f_i$ for some subfield F_i of $R/(M_i \cap R)$. Then there exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R such that $[A_{(0)} : R_{(0)}] = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i f_i g_i$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly $e_i f_i g_i$ maximal ideals $P_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_I(A)$ such that, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i g_i$: $P_{i,j}A' \in \mathbf{M}_I(A')$; $P_{i,j}A' \cap R' = M_i$; $[(A/P_{i,j}) : F_i] = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i g_i$; and, $(IA)_a = ([\prod_{i=1}^n (\prod_{j=1}^{e_i f_i g_i} P_{i,j})]^{e_1 \cdots e_n})_a$.*

(5.4.2) *Assume that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, R'/M_i has a simple algebraic extension field of degree $e_1 \cdots e_n$. Then there exists a finite separable integral extension domain A of R such that $[A_{(0)} : R_{(0)}] = (\prod_{i=1}^n e_i)^2$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly e_i maximal ideals $P_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_I(A)$ such that, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i$: $P_{i,j}A' \in \mathbf{M}_I(A')$; $P_{i,j}A' \cap R' = M_i$; $[(A/P_{i,j}) : (R'/M_i)] = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i$; and, $(IA)_a = ([\prod_{i=1}^n (\prod_{j=1}^{e_i} P_{i,j})]^{e_1 \cdots e_n})_a$.*

Proof. For (5.4.1), since R' is a Dedekind domain, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that there exists a finite separable integral extension Dedekind domain E of R such that $[E_{(0)} : R_{(0)}] = \prod_{i=1}^n e_i f_i g_i$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist exactly $e_i f_i g_i$ maximal ideals $N_{i,j} \in \mathbf{M}_I(E)$ such that, for $j = 1, \dots, e_i f_i g_i$: $N_{i,j} \cap R' = M_i$; $[(E/P_{i,j}) : F_i] = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i g_i$; and,

$IE = [\prod_{i=1}^n (\prod_{j=1}^{e_i f_i g_i} N_{i,j})]^{e_1 \cdots e_n}$. Therefore the conclusions follow from this, together with Proposition 3.9.

The proof of (5.4.2) is similar, but use Proposition 5.3 in place of Theorem 5.1. ■

The final result in this section follows immediately from combining Propositions 3.13 and 4.6.

Remark 5.5 With the notation of (3.1) and (3.2) (so $I = M_1^{e_1} \cdots M_n^{e_n}$) assume that each $K_i = D/M_i$ is finite with a subfield F_i such that $[K_i : F_i] = f_i$. Let $S = \{S(M_1), \dots, S(M_n)\}$ with $S(M_i) = \{(K_{i,j}, f_{i,j}, e_{i,j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ be a realizable m -consistent system for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$ and let E be the integral closure of D in a realization L of S for $\mathbf{M}_I(D)$. Then there exist positive integers t_1 and t_2 such that $IE = (\text{Rad}(IE))^{t_1}$ and such that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $[(E/N) : F_i] = t_2$ for all maximal ideals N in E that lie over M_i if and only if $t_1 = e_i e_{i,j}$ and $t_2 = f_i f_{i,j}$ for all i, j , and then $e_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} f_{i,j}$ and $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} e_{i,j}$.

References

- [1] C. Ciupercă, W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projectively equivalent ideals and Rees valuations*, J. Algebra 282 (2004), 140-156.
- [2] C. Ciupercă, W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projectively full ideals in Noetherian rings*, J. Algebra 304 (2006), 73-93.
- [3] C. Ciupercă, W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projectively full ideals in Noetherian rings* (II), J. Algebra 305 (2006), 974-992.
- [4] C. Ciupercă, W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projectively full ideals in Noetherian rings, a survey*, Algebra, Geometry and their Interactions Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 448, Amer. Math. Soc. 2007.
- [5] O. Endler, *Valuation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York 1972.
- [6] O. Endler, *Finite separable field extensions with prescribed valuations*, Manuscripta Math. 17 (1975), 383-408.

- [7] R. Gilmer, *Prüfer domains and rings of integer-valued polynomials*, J. Algebra, 129 (1990), 502-517.
- [8] H. Hasse, *Zwei Existensatz über algebraische Zahlkörper*, Math. Ann., 95 (1925), 229-238.
- [9] W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projectively full radical ideals in integral extension rings*, J. Algebra, 317 (2007), 333-350.
- [10] W. J. Heinzer, L. J. Ratliff, Jr., and D. E. Rush, *Projective equivalence of ideals in Noetherian integral domains*, J. Algebra, 320 (2008), 2349-2362.
- [11] W. Krull, *Über einen Existensatz der Bewertungstheorie*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg, 23 (1959), 29-55.
- [12] M. Nagata, *Local Rings*, Interscience, John Wiley, New York, 1962.
- [13] M. Nagata, *Note on a paper of Samuel concerning asymptotic properties of ideals*, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto, Ser. A Math. 30 (1957), 165-175.
- [14] D. Rees, *Valuations associated with ideals (II)*, J. London Math. Soc. 36 (1956), 221-228.
- [15] P. Ribenboim, *On the existence of fields with few discrete valuations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 216 (1964), 45-49.
- [16] P. Samuel, *Some asymptotic properties of powers of ideals*, Annals of Math 56 (1952), 11-21.
- [17] I. Swanson and C. Huneke, *Integral Closure of Ideals, Rings and Modules*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [18] R. Walker, *Algebraic Curves*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.
- [19] O. Zariski and P. Samuel, *Commutative Algebra, Vol. 1*, D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1958.

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-1395

E-mail address: heinzer@math.purdue.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Riverside, California 92521-0135

E-mail address: ratliff@math.ucr.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Riverside, California 92521-0135

E-mail address: rush@math.ucr.edu